



## Job Satisfaction and Job Performance, A Study on Colleges of Saudi Arabia

Taslim Khan<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Management, Birla Institute of Technology, International Center Muscat, Oman.

### Author's contribution

This whole work was carried out by the author TK.

### Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JSRR/2014/9931

#### Editor(s):

- (1) Nidal Rashid Sabri, Ex. Dean of College of Economics (2005-2011), Birzeit University, Palestine.
- (2) James P. Concannon, Associate Professor of Education Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, USA.
- (3) Luigi Rodino, Professor of Mathematical Analysis, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Torino, Italy.

#### Reviewers:

- (1) Anonymous, Daegu University, South Korea.
- (2) Anonymous, University of Botswana, USA.
- (3) Anonymous, Tel Hai College, Tel Hai, Israel.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?iid=664&id=22&aid=6135>

Original Research Article

Received 8<sup>th</sup> March 2014  
Accepted 7<sup>th</sup> August 2014  
Published 16<sup>th</sup> September 2014

### ABSTRACT

**Aims:** The purpose of this current study is to examine the relation between job satisfaction and job performance among the employees who are currently working for colleges in eastern region of Saudi Arabia.

**Study Design:** Research Study was based on MSQ, The Employees were from Non - Teaching Background the data was collected from three different colleges and 91 samples were collected as completely filled for this study.

**Place and Duration of Study:** Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the duration was of 2 months, from November to January (2013-2014).

**Methodology:** The Sample of the present study is drawn from non - teaching employees from different colleges of Saudi Arabia mainly from the eastern province. 125 questionnaires were distributed among the employees of 5 colleges. Simple random

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [Taslimkhan82@hotmail.com](mailto:Taslimkhan82@hotmail.com);

sampling technique was used and 91 responses were returned with a response rate of 75.8%. The researcher distributed the questionnaire in person.

**Results:** The result indicates that there is a positive significant association between job performance and job satisfaction. The result also reveals that job satisfaction affects job performance. The present study suggests that the management should pay more attention onto non - teaching employees' job satisfaction in order to enhance job performance.

**Conclusion:** The key purpose of the current study was to observe the relation among satisfaction of job and job performance, mainly the employees, who are working at various colleges of Saudi Arabia. The outcome of the current study reveals a significant positive association between job satisfaction and job performance.

*Keywords: Job performance; non-teaching staff; job satisfaction; eastern province; Saudi Arabia.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Higher education in Saudi Arabia has undergone a tremendous growth over the last five decades. The education system is primarily under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education, the General Organization for Technical Education, Ministry of Higher Education and Vocational Training. The highest authority supervising education in Saudi Arabia is the Supreme Committee for Educational Policy, established in 1963. Other authorities such as the Presidency of the National Guard, Ministry of Defense, Aviation and the Ministry of the Interior provide their affiliates and children with education at all levels, consistent with Ministry of Education guidelines.

Extreme performance of Persons will help organization to fulfill their goals Dessler [1]. As human capital is the key issue in service process, most of the organizations seek to enhance job performance among their employees in order to achieve high levels of productivity, efficiency and effectiveness. The focus on employees' efforts to improve organization's performance has become stronger as they need to react rapidly and effectively to market demands Cho et al. [2].

However, there are several factors that can be attributed to employees' job performance. One factor that affects job performance is job satisfaction. Contented employees are productive or those who are satisfied with their work are likely to be better performers (Fisher, Saari and Judge) [3,4,5]. Job satisfaction has been found to influence job performance (Chen et al. [6] Spector) [7]. Satisfied workers increase the chance of higher productivity. According to Jain and Triandis [8], common sense proposed that job satisfaction leads to high productivity.

Many literatures related to job satisfaction have showed that job satisfaction can be one of the main determinants of organizational performance (Angle and Perry, 1981, Riketta, 2002, Spence Laschinger et al. [9,10,11]. Levy [12] has argued that results of satisfaction lead to a better performance, a reduction in turnover, and changing of behaviors. Hence, it can be said that, for better perceptive on the relationship among satisfaction in job and job performance has become extremely important, especially for the service organizations that depend heavily on employees to offer friendly and courteous services to their customers in this competitive market.

Although, many studies were conducted in many countries, recent trend has indicated that there is a lack of research in this area among the employees in Saudi Arabia. Therefore, this study will give an idea on the satisfaction in job and job performance among employees of various colleges in Saudi Arabia. The purpose of the present study is to observe the impact of job satisfaction on job performance between non-teaching staff'.

The present study is separated into 5 sections. Segment one is the introduction, segment two is the literature review, segment three is the research methodology, segment four is the findings, and segment five is the conclusion.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is an interesting topic among practitioners and researchers Lu [13]. This is due to its effects on increasing productivity McNeese-Smith [14], enhancing customers' satisfaction Burke [15], encouraging better performance and efficiency Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza [16]. Locke [17] has define job satisfaction as a positive emotional feelings ensuring from acceptable evaluation of his/her experience towards the job Locke [17]. Kalleberg [18] has suggested that job satisfaction contains intrinsic and extrinsic components.

According to Hirschfield [19], intrinsic satisfaction of job refer to how people believe towards the nature of the job tasks while extrinsic satisfaction of job feels about aspect of the work condition that are external to the job responsibilities. Several theories have been developed to explain the nature of job satisfaction. In late 1950s, many researchers have theorized the nature of job satisfaction, developed models, and carried out study to test their models Lacy and Sheehan [20]. Job satisfaction theories are classified by researchers into content theories and process theories Coomber and Louise Barriball [21]. According to Lunenburg [22], content theories focus on the needs and factors that motivate behaviors, whereas process theories concentrate on the source of behaviors and the factors that affect the strength and direction of the behaviors. The two popular contents theories are Herzberg theory and Maslow theory [23].

Herzberg and his colleagues have claimed that hygiene factors will not make people dissatisfied; instead they will only avoid them from being dissatisfied, whereas motivating factors contributes toward satisfaction of job and motivation. Another better known theory is Maslow's [24] hierarchical need theory. Maslow's theory consists of five levels of individual needs: physiological needs, social needs, safety, esteem, and self-actualization. Esteem and self-actualization needs are at the top level while safety, social, and physiological needs are at the bottom level.

### **2.2 Job Performance**

Job performance is one of the major indicator in assessing organizational performance Wall [25]. Schermerhorn [26] has defined job performance as quantity and quality achieved by individual or group after completing a task. Munchinsky [27] has suggested that job performance is the set of employee's behaviors that can be measured, monitored, and evaluated achievement at individual's level. Viswesvaran and Ones [28] have described performance of job as "behavior and outcome that staff hold in or carry about that are

connected with and contribute to organizational goals". Traditionally, job performance was viewed as a single construct but researchers now agree that job performance is multidimensional factor Villanova, and Austin [29]. To support this, Motowidlo and Scotter [30] have suggested that job performance should comprise of task performance and contextual performance.

Campbell [31] has proposed eight dimensions of performance of job which are job specific task ability, non-job-specific task skills, oral and written communication, challenge, maintain individual regulation, maintaining team and peer performance, administration/leadership, and supervision/administration. Robbins [32] has categorized the height of performance into job, and personal traits and job behavior, Lee [33] has divided it into quality, value and effectiveness. According to Lee [33] efficiency refers to the workers' output rate and the ability to achieve tasks before deadline, effectiveness refers to the workers' objective and achievement, quality refers to workers' fault and grievance rate, managers' fulfillment, customers' satisfaction, and colleagues' satisfaction.

### **2.3 Relationship between Job Performance and Job Satisfaction**

Vroom [34], reviewed 20 studies that were carried out between the 1949 and 1963. that examined the connection between job performance and job satisfaction, reported a median correlation of  $r = 0.14$ . Since publication of Vroom's results, others have attempted to replicate his findings. Petty [35] used meta-analysis techniques to replicate Vroom's finding. They analyzed 20 studies published between 1967 and 1982, as well as 15 studies used by Vroom which utilized individual-level measure of job performance and job satisfaction, when they excluded the studies included by Vroom [34], they calculated an average effect size of .23 based on the remaining studies.

According to Judge [5], the problems and limitations in previous research was due to lack of an assimilation and integration of the different models in the literature. Unlike previous studies, Fisher [3] summarized two of his study, in his first study on the opinions of managers, supervisors, and employees; he found that the majority believed feelings of satisfaction to be associated with job performance. In his second study he found that a majority of the participants in his study on inexperienced undergraduates agrees that employees who are satisfied with their work are usually do good performance. In a comprehensive meta-analysis conducted by Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) and consisting 74 studies showed a considerable variation in correlations between job satisfaction and job performance across different aspects of job satisfaction, ranging between 0.6 for pay satisfaction and 0.29 for overall job satisfaction [36]. However, later several studies, conducted on the association between job performance and job satisfaction found a positive relationship among both the variables.

Nimalathasan and Brabete [27] carried out a study on job performance and job satisfaction. The result revealed a positive connection between two variables, that high level of fair promotion, reasonable salary system, appropriate work itself, and good working condition lead to high level of employees' performance. In the study conducted by Prasanga and Gamage [37] the findings indicates that satisfaction of job is one of the most important factor in determining job performance, and leads to high performance. Moorman (1993) attributed a weak and modest link which has been found between job satisfaction and job performance was due to the measuring the wrong kind of performance [38]. Based on the above evidences, it could be concluded that job satisfaction is shown to be positively associated with job performance. Thus, hypotheses are as the following:

## 2.4 Hypotheses

H1: Positive relation between job performance and job satisfaction.

## 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample of the present study is based on the non-teaching employees from different colleges of Saudi Arabia mainly from the eastern province. 125 questionnaires were distributed among the employees of 5 colleges. Simple random sampling technique was used and 91 responses were returned with a response rate of 75.8%. The researcher distributed the questionnaire in person. The respondents were briefed on the study objectives and they were given the guidelines in answering the questionnaires. The respondents' demographic data is shown below in Table 1.

### 3.1 Instruments

Three different questionnaires were used to assess the main variables in this study.

#### 3.1.1 Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction (independent variable), was accessed the MSQ Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Weiss, [39] is used. It consisted of three scales which were intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction. Overall satisfaction was identified on the basis all 20 items. Five point Likert scale question rated as 1 = very dissatisfied to 5 = very satisfied.

#### 3.1.2 Job performance

Job performance (dependent variable) was measured with six items that were created in Turkish (Şahin, 2011). The items were derived from job performance literature (Motowidlo and Van Scotter [30]). These items were as the following: 1- I find effective solutions to problems, 2- I adapt easily to changing situations, 3- I assume a sense of ownership and responsibility in the quality of personal performance, 4- I strive to meet deadlines, 5- I encourage colleagues to do more than what is expected, 6- I create effective work relationship with others. Fivepoint Likert scale question rated as 1 = poor to 5 = excellent.

### 3.2 Data Analysis

Collected data were entered to computer using SPSS version 19. The following statistics were used: descriptive statistics consisted mean and standard deviation in order to have clear picture of study variables. To determine the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction, a Pearson correlation (  $r$  ) was used, a perfect positive correlation when it is +1, or perfect negative correlation when it close to -1 Sekaran (2003). Regression analysis was conducted to examine the effect of job satisfaction on job performance.

## 4. FINDINGS

The Demo graphic factor regarding the Age, Gender Years of Services and Level of Education are explain in the Table 1.

**Table 1. Demographic facts**

Variable	Age (years)				
	18-28	29-39	40-50	51-61	
Frequency	42	31	11	7	
Percentage	46.2 %	34 %	12 %	7.7 %	
Variable	Gender				
	Male	Female			
Frequency	71	20			
Percentage	78%	22%			
Variable	Years of service				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25
Frequency	25	39	14	8	5
Percentage	27.4 %	42.8 %	15.4 %	8.7 %	5.5 %
Variable	Level of education				
	Secondary school	Diploma	Degree		
Frequency	13	42	36		
percentage	14.2 %	46.2 %	39.5 %		

#### 4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 represents the value of mean for job satisfaction and job performance. The 3.67 mean value for overall job satisfaction indicates the employees are satisfaction with their jobs. The aggregate mean value of 3.53 for job performance indicates that employees perform highly. Standard deviations for both variables are close to 1 which is at an acceptable level.

**Table 2. Descriptive statistics on variables studied**

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation
Job satisfaction	3.67	.81
Job performance	3.53	.67

**Table 3. Correlation between job satisfaction and job performance**

		Job satisfaction	Job performance
JS	Pearson correlation	1	.562**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	91	91
JP	Pearson correlation	.562**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	91	91

\*\**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), JS = Job satisfaction, JP = Job performance*

Correlation of job satisfaction with Job performance in Table 3, shows that JS is positively related with JP (R = .561, P<.01). Thus the research hypothesis H1 is accepted and proven to be true as positive relationship between both the variables.

## 4.2 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis in Table 4 (4a, 4b, 4c) shows that R value = .561 represents a correlation among job satisfaction and job performance. R Square = .316 indicates that 31.6 % change in job performance is due to job satisfaction. F = 40.175, showing a significance at the .000 , showing that, a model fit for job satisfaction and job performance, thus research hypothesis 2 is substantiated. Regression coefficient (B) of job satisfaction as .58 shows that 1 unit change in job satisfaction will bring around .58 unit change in job performance.

Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to evaluate the internal consistency of instrument. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for job satisfaction was .87 and job performance was .84, which indicates internal reliability of the instrument. a study conducted by Gu and Siu [40] on relationship between job satisfaction and job performance among the employees working in Macao casino hotels found a significant relationship between job satisfaction and job performance.

**Table 4. Regression analysis of variables studied**

**Table 4a. Model**

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.562a	.316	.309	11.07111

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job satisfaction

**Table 4b. ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	5137.078	1	5137.078	40.175	.000 <sup>a</sup>
Residual	10807.456	89	121.460		
Total	14845.555	90			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job satisfaction, b. Dependent Variable: job performance

**Table 4c. Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. error	Beta		
(Constant)	21.081		6.635	3.177	.002
Job satisfaction	.580	.090	.562	6.418	.000

## 5. CONCLUSION

The key purpose of the current study was to observe the relation among satisfaction of job and job performance, mainly the employees, who are working at various colleges of Saudi Arabia. The outcome of the current study reveals a significant positive relations between job satisfaction and job performance. The study also reveals that job satisfaction influences job performance.

The present study contributes by representing job satisfaction as an vital role in enhancing job performance. However, compared with recent studies which claimed that job satisfaction

influences job performance, the current studies validates the results obtained by these studies and generalized it to working staff in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Based on the result of the current study, management should focus more attention to their employees job satisfaction as a way to increase employees job performance.

Although, the present study contribute to the partial knowledge on job satisfaction and job performance in Saudi Arabia, the limitations can be said as, First- the study selects the most commonly studied variables and there are others variables such as leadership style, conflict and ambiguity role, organizational commitment, and culture which should be considered in future researches. Second-data has been collect via questionnaire which may not capture the true responses from the participants to overcome the limitations additional research can be recommend to explain the relation between two variables, using different measures and including big sample.

## **COMPETING INTERESTS**

Author has declared that no competing interests exist.

## **REFERENCE**

1. Dessler G. Human Resource Management, Prentic-Hall, USA. Fisher, CD 2003, why do lay people believe that satisfaction and performance are correlated? Possible sources of a commonsense theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2011;24(6):753-777.
2. Cho S, Woods RH, Jang SC, Erdem M. Measuring the impact of human resource management practices on hospitality firms performances. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 2006;25(2):262-277.
3. Fisher CD. Why do lay people believe that satisfaction and performance are correlated? Possible sources of a commonsense theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2003;24(6):753-777.
4. Saari LM, Judge TA. Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*. 2004;43(4):395-407.
5. Judge TA, Thoresen CJ, Bono JE. Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2001;86(1):80-92.
6. Chen SH, Yang CC, Shiau JY, Wang HH. The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. *The TQM Magazine*, 2006;18(5):484-500.
7. Spector PE. *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA;1997.
8. Jain RK, Triandis HC. *Management of research and development organizations: managing the unmanageable*. John Wiley & Sons, New York; 1997.
9. Angle HL, Perry JL. An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative science quarterly*. 1981;26(1):1-14.
10. Riketta M. Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2002;23(3):257-266.
11. Spence Laschinger HK, Finegan J, Shamian J. The impact of work place empowerment, organizational trust on staff nurses work satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Health Care Management Review*. 2001;26(7):7-23.



12. Levy PL. Industrial/organizational psychology: Understanding the workplace, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston; 2003.
13. Lu H, While AE, Louise Barriball K. Job satisfaction among nurses: A literature review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 2005;42(2):211-227.
14. Mcneese-Smith DK. The influence of manager behavior on nurses job satisfaction, productivity, and commitment. *Journal of Nursing Administration*. 1997;27(9):47-55.
15. Burke RJ, Graham J, Smith FJ. Putting the customer second, the TQM Magazine, 2005;17(1):85-91.
16. Sousa-Poza A, Sousa-Poza AA. Well-being at work: A cross-national AA 2000. *Well-being at work: A cross-national economics*. 2000;29(6):517-538.
17. Locke EA. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Rand McNally, Chicago; 1976.
18. Kalleberg AL. Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*. 1977;42(1):124-143.
19. Hirschfeld RR. Does revising the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form make a difference? *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 2000;60(5):255-270.
20. Lacy FJ, Sheehan BA. Job satisfaction among academic staff: An International Perspective. *Higher Education*. 1997;34(3):305-322.
21. Coomber B, Louise Barriball K. Impact of job satisfaction components on intent to leave and turnover for hospital-based nurses: A review of the research literature. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 2007;44(2):297-314.
22. Lunenburg F, Ornstein A, Zhou Z. *Educational administration: Concepts and practices*, Wadsworth, Stamford, CT; 2008.
23. Herzberg F, Mausner B, Snyderman B. *The Motivation to Work*, Wiley, New York; 1959.
24. Maslow AH. *Motivation and personality*, Harper and Row, New York. Mcneese-Smith, DK 1997. The influence of manager behavior on nurses job satisfaction, productivity, and commitment. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 1997;27(9):47-55.
25. Wall TD, Michie J, Patterson M, Wood SJ, Sheehan M, Clegg CW, West M. On the validity of subjective measures of company performance. *Personnel Psychology*. 2004;57(1):95-118.
26. Schermerhorn JR. *Management for productivity*, John Wiley and Sons, New York; 1989.
27. Muchinsky PM. *Psychology Applied to Work*, Wadsworth, Belmont, CA. Nimalathanan, B & Brabete, V 2010. Job satisfaction and employees' work performance: A case study of people's bank in Jaffna Peninsula, Sri Lanka', *Management and Marketing Journal*. 2003;8(1):43-47.
28. Viswesvaran C, Ones DS. Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*. 2000;8(8):216-226.
29. Austin JT, Villanova P. the criterion problem: 1917–1992. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1992;77(6):836-874.
30. Motowidlo SJ, Van Scotter JR. 'Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1994;79(4):475-480.
31. Campbell JP. *Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology*. Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA; 1990.
32. Robbins SP. *Organizational behavior*, prentice hall international, upper saddle river, N.J; 1998.

33. Lee YD, Lain JW, Chen CY. A study on the measurement of productivity for white-collar employees-A case of electronic industry in Taiwan. The Chinese Military Academy Journal. 1999;14(1):345-361.
34. Vroom VH. Work and motivation, Wiley, New York; 1964.
35. Petty MM, Mcgee GW, Cavender JW. A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. Academy of Management Review. 1984;9(4):712-721.
36. Iaffaldano MT, Muchinsky PM. Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin. 1985;97(2):251-273.
37. Prasanga AP, Gamage AS. Job satisfaction and job performance of the sailors in rapid action boat squadron of Sri Lanka Navy. Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management. 2012;3(1):49-54.
38. Moorman RH. The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. Human Relations. 1993;46(6):759-776.
39. Weiss DJ, Dawis RV, England GW. Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis MN; 1967.
40. GU Z, Siu RC. 'Drivers of job satisfaction as related to work performance in Macao casino hotels: An investigation based on employee survey. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management. 2009;21(5):561-578.

---

© 2014 Khan; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*  
*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*  
<http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?iid=664&id=22&aid=6135>